

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Amendments were made to the specification to correct errors and to clarify the specification. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the specification.

Claims 1-43 are pending in the present application. Claims 2-8 and 11-42 were cancelled; claims 1, 9, 10 and 43 were amended; and claims 44 and 45 were added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **I. Objection to Claims**

The Examiner objected to claims 33 and 35. The objection is moot because claims 33 and 35 have been cancelled.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation (Claims 1-2, 10-12, 21-22 and 30-31)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 10-12, 21-22 and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Chopra et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,631,466 (hereinafter Chopra). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 8 and all intervening claims in accordance with the indication of allowable subject matter by the examiner. Additional non-substantive modifications to the claims have been made. Applicants submit that claim 1 is now in a condition for allowance. Claim 9 depends from allowable claim 1.

### **III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness (Claims 3-6, 23-25, 28 and 41)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 3-6, 23-25, 28 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Chopra et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,631,466 (hereinafter Chopra) in view of McAuley et al. ("Fast routing table lookup using CAMs") (hereinafter McAuley). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3-6, 23-25, 28 and 41 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 3-6, 23-25, 28 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is moot.

**IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness (Claims 7, 26, 29 and 38-39)**

Claims 7, 26, 29 and 38-39 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 7, 26, 29 and 38-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

**V. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness (Claims 13-16, 36-37 and 40)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 13-16, 36-37 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Chopra et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,631,466 (hereinafter Chopra) in view of Decasper et al. ("Router Plugins: A software Architecture for Next-Generation Routers") (hereinafter Decasper). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 13-16, 36-37 and 40 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 13-16, 36-37 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is moot.

**VI. Allowable Subject Matter (Claims 8-9, 20, 27, 32-34 and 42)**

The Examiner indicated that claims 8-9, 20, 27, 32-34 and 42 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to include the limitations of claims 8 and 20 and all intervening claims.

New claims 44 and 45 are presented to claim the allowable subject matter with less than all of the intervening claims. Applicant submits that the allowable subject matter is sufficient to distinguish over the prior art because the prior art does not disclose wild cards in the context of the claim.

**VII. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited reference(s) and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: October 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Rudolf O. Siegesmund/

Rudolf O. Siegesmund  
Reg. No. 37,720  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicant